



City of Austin Integrated Solid Waste Management Master Plan

Workshop 1 – Preliminary Research Report
Tuesday, August 31st

Workshop Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Background
- Purpose
- Public Workshop Schedule
- Private Sector Assessment, Non-City Programs, and Partnership Case Studies
- Methods for Improving Local Markets for Recycled Materials, Regulating Service Providers, and Establishing Mechanisms for Regional Cooperation
- Small Group Discussion and Report Back
- Next Steps

Background

- Zero Waste Strategic Plan adopted by City Council in January 2009
- Long-range Integrated Solid Waste Management Master Plan initiated in spring 2009
 - To focus on Implementation and Funding
- Stakeholder feedback on scoping conducted in summer/fall 2009
- Preliminary research initiated in spring 2010
- Needs Assessment undertaken concurrently
 - 60 current and potential new initiatives evaluated
 - To be discussed in detail at November 2010 charrette

Purpose of Tonight's Meeting

- **Present results of preliminary research report**
 - Specific research items assigned by stakeholders
 - Private sector assessment, non-city programs, and partnership case studies
 - Methods for improving local markets for recycled materials, regulating service providers, and establishing mechanisms for regional cooperation
- **Obtain feedback from stakeholders on research assignment**
- **Next workshop will address**
 - Review new solid waste services and relevant city initiatives
 - Project diversion and disposal rates based on expansion of existing and new initiatives
 - Project planning level costs based on expansion of existing and new initiatives

Public Workshop Schedule

Workshop 1- Preliminary Research Report
August 2010

A large, light gray arrow pointing downwards, indicating the sequence from Workshop 1 to Workshop 2.

Workshop 2 – Needs Assessment Charrette
November 2010

A large, light gray arrow pointing downwards, indicating the sequence from Workshop 2 to Workshop 3.

Workshop 3 – Draft ISWMMP Presentation
March 2011

Terms You Will Hear Tonight

- EPR – Extended Producer Responsibility, where producers of products take responsibility for the end of life of their products
- HHW – Household Hazardous Waste, including batteries, oil and paint
- COG – Council of Governments, a regional planning agency
- ILA – InterLocal Agreement, an agreement signed between two or more public agencies or private entities to undertake a common purpose
- ISWMMP – The City of Austin Integrated Solid Waste Management Master Plan, the implementation plan for zero waste
- LC3 - Low-profit limited liability company, a new legal form of business entity created to bridge the gap between non-profit and for profit investing
- MRF – Materials Recovery Facility for processing recyclables or mixed waste
- TxDOT – Texas Department of Transportation

Definition of Zero Waste

- Zero Waste is a goal that is ethical, economical, efficient and visionary, to guide people in changing their lifestyles and practices to emulate sustainable natural cycles, where all discarded materials are designed to become resources for others to use.
- Zero Waste means designing and managing products and processes to systematically avoid and eliminate the volume and toxicity of waste and materials, conserve and recover all resources, and not burn or bury them.
- Implementing Zero Waste will eliminate all discharges to land, water or air that are a threat to planetary, human, animal or plant health.

– Zero Waste International Alliance, August 2009

Purpose and objectives of the research assignment

- Stakeholders met in summer/fall 2009 to identify specific scope items:
 - Review non-SWS services, programs and facilities
 - Examine tools to foster partnerships
 - Conduct research on methods to encourage and promote markets for reclaimed and recycled materials
 - Evaluate methods to promote use of reclaimed and recycled materials in construction projects
 - Evaluate methods for promotion of voluntary “Take Back” programs
 - Evaluate mechanisms for regulating private service providers and generators
 - Evaluate mechanisms for regional cooperation

Private Sector Assessment, Public Agencies, Institutions and Non-Profits Partnership Case Studies

Opportunities for Partnerships

- Partnering with public agencies with needs for similar services
- Partnering with non-profits with specialized expertise
- Fostering partnerships with private sector service providers

Public Agencies, Institutions and Non-Profits

Surveys	Recommendations
Cedar Park Georgetown	Discuss partnerships in MRF, yard trimmings, and HHW processing capacity
Austin Independent School District and University of Texas	Discuss projects for collaboration, including: outreach and education and service alignment; support efforts of UT- Arlington Zero Waste Center
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority	Provide proposal to service Cap Metro litter cans and recycling containers throughout the city
Ecology Action Goodwill Industries	Discuss workforce development related to new city initiatives, including the new single stream MRF and providing an expanded network of recycling drop-off centers throughout the City

Private Sector Assessment

Surveys

- Balcones Resources
- Central Texas Refuse
- River City Roll Offs
- Texas Disposal Systems, Inc.

Findings

Private Sector Service Providers:

- Have unused capacity at their facilities
- Could process additional materials for reuse, recycling and composting from Austin waste generators

Recommendations

- Before building new rate-payer funded public facilities access existing capacity of private companies and non-profit entities through competitive service agreements
- Review all existing service contracts to align the City's interests with its contractors
- Renegotiate terms to enhance transparency, incentives and innovations, if appropriate

Partnership Case Studies

Surveys

- Boulder County/Eco-Cycle
- City of Napa/Napa Recycling and Waste Services
- City and County of San Francisco/Recology
- City of Berkeley/Urban Ore

Tools to Foster Partnerships

- Alignment of Interests
- Transparency
- Frequent Contact
- Letting Expectations be Known
- Utilizing the Experts
- Innovations/Scope Modifications
- Stability
- L3C

These folks gave us insights into how to structure contracts/partnerships to support our zero waste policy

Methods for Improving Local Markets for Recycled Materials

- Voluntary Take Back Programs
- Regulating Service Providers
- Establishing Mechanisms for Regional Cooperation

Methods for Improving Local Markets for Recycled Materials

Local Manufacturer Profiles	Construction Contractor Profiles
ACCO Waste Paper of Austin	City of Austin Public Works
Coca-Cola Bottling Company	Jamail & Smith Construction
Cycled Plastics	Laughlin-Thyssen, Inc.
Dell Computers	Texas Department of Transportation
Fuquay, Inc.	
Image MicroSystems	
JOSCO Products	
Old Texas Floors	
Vintage Material Supply Co.	

These organizations told us the best way to improve local markets for recycled materials

Methods for Improving Local Markets for Recycled Materials

Best Practices

- Reduce contamination rates of collected materials
- Phase in collection of new materials in City programs
- Create long-term agreements with processors to pay for development of new facility processing capacity
- Phase in requirements for commercial and multi-family to include all of the same material types included in residential program
- Phase in requirements for construction/demolition activities, ensuring that all loads are processed for recycling
- Match TxDOT specifications for use of recycled materials in public works construction projects
- Support disposal bans of recyclable and compostable materials

Methods for Improving Local Markets for Recycled Materials

Siting Assistance and Funding

- Expand, attract, and support reuse, recycling and composting businesses and related green collar jobs
- Reserve sufficient land for Zero Waste infrastructure
- Provide grants and loans to start-up businesses
- Obtain federal funding for reuse, recycling and composting facilities

Voluntary “Take Back” Programs

Take-back Programs in Other Jurisdictions	Local Retailer Profiles
British Columbia, Canada	Barton Springs Nursery
Del Norte County, California	Batteries Plus
New York City, New York	Bicycle Sport Shop
City of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	Commercial Surface Installations
San Luis Obispo County, California	H-E-B
Santa Clara County, California	Hewlett-Packard Company
	Live Oak Pharmacy
	Specs Wine, Spirits & Fine Food
	The Light Bulb Shop
	Westbank Dry Cleaning
	Whole Foods

These organizations told us what has been successful in other areas and best practices locally

Voluntary “Take Back” Programs

Findings

- Retailers surveyed were open to taking back products or packaging they sell if it is convenient and did not impose a burden to retailers or customers
- Voluntary programs limited to materials and retailers willing to participate
- Voluntary programs directly affect retailers, but do not affect manufacturers or achieve true EPR
- If local government does not pay for cost of collection, retailers may drop the program

Best practices for voluntary take-back

- Promote participating retailers by including them in City publications and websites
- Publish a Take-it-Back guide
- Ensure that materials (handled by the City) are collected regularly and do not accumulate

Regulating Service Providers

Background

Materials generated within Austin are estimated to be:

- Controlled through City operations and contracts - **25 percent**
- Controlled by private sector collectors licensed by the City and private recyclers operating in Austin - **68 percent**
- Are self-hauled to landfills and recycling centers - **7 percent**

We investigated local, state and federal laws and identified options for regulating private service providers

Regulating Service Providers

Methods for Regulating Private Sector Service Providers

- **Directly**
 - Exclusive franchise areas
 - Non-exclusive franchises
 - Permit requirements
- **Indirectly**
 - Requirements on generators (mandatory recycling)
 - Rate-setting requirements
 - Bundled rates
 - Banded rates

Establishing Mechanisms for Regional Cooperation

Organizations profiled

- North Texas Municipal Water District
- Gulf Coast Waste Disposal Authority
- Upper Sabine Valley Solid Waste Management District
- City of Fort Worth, Tarrant County, & Denton County ILA
- Bay Area Recycling Outreach Coalition
- Northwest Product Stewardship Council
- Texas Product Stewardship Council
- GLOW Region Solid Waste Management Committee
- California Product Stewardship Council
- Envision Central Texas
- Brazos Valley Solid Waste Management Agency
- North Central Texas COG Solid Waste Program
- Orange County Workforce Investment Board

We looked at areas that have regional cooperation in place to understand best practices for this concept.

Establishing Mechanisms for Regional Cooperation

Functions Appropriate for Regionalization

- Regional planning
- Program implementation
- Facility implementation
- Outreach and education
- Advocacy
- Research and development
- Economic development

Establishing Mechanisms for Regional Cooperation

Approaches for Regionalization

- Solid Waste Management Districts
- Interlocal Agreements
- Expanding the Role of CAPCOG
- Informal Regional Coalition as a Mechanism for Regional Cooperation
- Formation of a New Non-Profit Agency as a Mechanism for Regional Cooperation
- Federal and State Grants used as Mechanisms for Regional Cooperation

Establishing Mechanisms for Regional Cooperation

Function	Appropriate Regional Mechanism	Rationale	Example
Regional planning	COG or ILA	ILA for areas larger than COGs	CAPCOG NCTCOG
Program implementation	ILA	Flexible, but binding on signatories	Fort Worth ILA
Facility implementation	SWMD, ILA or Non-Profit	Bonding capability, commitment of materials	North Texas Municipal Water District BVSWMA
Outreach and education	Coalition	Flexible, informal	BayROC GLOW
Advocacy	Coalition or Non-Profit	Flexible, informal	TXPSC Envision Central Texas
Research and development	University or Non-Profit	Grant funding opportunities	UT Zero Waste Center Chelsea Center Syracuse Center
Economic development	Coalition or Non-Profit	Grant funding opportunities	Institute for Local Self-Reliance

Next Steps

Needs Assessment – November 2010

- Review Solid Waste Services Department services, programs, and facilities
- Project waste generation over 40 year planning period
- Describe regional public and private infrastructure
- Review existing solid waste services and relevant city initiatives
- Review new solid waste services and relevant city initiatives
- Project diversion and disposal rates based on expansion of existing and new initiatives
- Project planning level costs based on expansion of existing and new initiatives
- Identify facilities needs over 40 year period, including resource recovery parks, material recovery, composting, construction and demolition, mixed waste processing facilities, and residual waste disposal capacity

Draft ISWMMP – March 2011

- Financial Plan
- Implementation Plan

Small Group Discussion

Chance to share your thoughts on the information presented and tell us what is most important to you

- **Opportunities for Partnerships**
- **Best practices for voluntary take-back**
- **Zero waste regulations**
- **Approaches for regionalization**

Public Workshop Schedule

Workshop 1- Preliminary Research Report
August 2010

A large, light gray arrow pointing downwards, indicating the sequence from Workshop 1 to Workshop 2.

Workshop 2 – Needs Assessment Charrette
November 2010

A large, light gray arrow pointing downwards, indicating the sequence from Workshop 2 to Workshop 3.

Workshop 3 – Draft ISWMMP Presentation
March 2011

Thank you!

For more information on Austin Zero Waste:
www.ci.austin.tx.us/sws/zerowaste.htm